

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-23 are pending.

The Examiner rejected claim 13 as being indefinite, as it was not clear which "said target" is being referenced. By this amendment, claim 13 has been amended to specify the third target.

The Examiner rejected claims 17, 18 and 21 as being clearly anticipated by Vand. Claim 17 has been amended to specify that the supports are triangular. The triangular supports have a wide base to create stability of the chipping target. Also, the supports do not require spikes placed into the ground and therefore retain the capability of being used on a hard surface, such as pavement.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 15 and 16 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kohn. The Examiner noted that Kohn did not disclose the "removably connected" limitation regarding the targets. The Examiner reasoned that it was commonly known to provide devices such that they may be broken down for portability purposes and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have done the same with Kohn's device for the same purpose. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kohn discloses a series of targets 11, 12, 13, 14, each a successively smaller size with the smaller ones placed within the next larger target. With the smaller targets 14, 13 and 12 placed within the larger targets, the assembled targets have the most compact configuration. Removing the targets placed within the other targets would not present a smaller configuration, nor increase the ease in portability. There is no advantage in portability to be gained in removing the targets.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 19 and 20, as obvious over Kohn, in view of Vand. The Examiner relied upon Vand for a pivotal connection between support and target and stakes. The disclosure of Vand does not cure the above mentioned deficiencies of Kohn.

Claim 8 was rejected as being obvious over Kohn in view of Pelton. The Examiner relied upon Pelton for disclosing the use of a cross member for providing additional stability to a target. Pelton, likewise, does not cure the deficiencies of the disclosure of Kohn noted above.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-14 as being unpatentable

over Yalvac. Claims 9-14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Similar to Kohn, Yalvac does not disclose targets removably connected to each other. In addition, if string 5 is considered a strap, Yalvac has a single target, as the string cannot be considered both a strap and as forming a second target.


The Examiner rejected claim 20, as obvious over Kohn, in view of Yalvac. The Examiner stated that it is known to use straps to attach targets together. As mentioned previously, the strings 5 separate a single target into different zones. The straps cannot be considered both creating a target and for connecting targets.

Claim 22 appears to be rejected over Kohn in view of Yalvac, as the Examiner states it is known to use straps to attach targets together as disclosed by Yalvac. The reasoning set forth with regard to the rejection of claim 20, applies equally to the rejection of claim 22. The strings 5 separate a single target into different zones and cannot be said to attach targets to one another.

The claims, as amended, are allowable over the prior art. Favorable action is eagerly and earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, and the Examiner believes a telephone conversation would resolve such issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

If any additional fees are due and owing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account 08-2455.

Respectfully submitted,


Christopher J. McDonald
Reg. 41,533

February 17, 2004

HOFFMAN, WASSON & GITLER, PC
2461 South Clark Street
Crystal Center 2 - Suite 522
Arlington, VA 22202
(703) 415-0100

Attorney's Docket: A-7466.AMA/bh